



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/798,580

03/10/2004

Arnold Blinn

MS#304543.01 (5101)

6335

38779 7590 04/13/2009  
SENNIGER POWERS LLP (MSFT)  
100 NORTH BROADWAY  
17TH FLOOR  
ST. LOUIS, MO 63102

EXAMINER

SHAIFER HARRIMAN, DANT B

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2434

NOTIFICATION DATE

DELIVERY MODE

04/13/2009

ELECTRONIC

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

uspatents@senniger.com

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/798,580	<b>Applicant(s)</b> BLINN ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> DANT B. SHAFER HARRIMAN	<b>Art Unit</b> 2434	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 30 January 2009.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1- 10, 15, 19, 20, 22, 23, 30, 32 - 35 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1- 10, 15, 19, 20, 22, 23, 30, 32 - 35 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 10 March 2004 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                     | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)           |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____                                      |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)          | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____  | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                          |

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Response to Amendment*

Status of the instant application:

- Claims 1, 15, 22, 35 are currently amended in the instant application.
- Claims 2 – 10, 19, 20, 23, 33, 36, 38 are original in the instant application.
- Claims 11 – 14, 16 – 18, 21, 24—29, 31, 39 – 40 are cancelled in the instant application.
- Claims 30, 32, 34 are previously presented in the instant application.

### *Response to Arguments*

Applicant's arguments and remarks filed 01/30/2009 have been fully considered and have been found to be not persuasive, please see the examiners response to applicant's arguments and corresponding office action below.

Examiners response to applicant's arguments:

Applicant states: "Applicants disagree with the Examiner's assertion on page 4 of the action that paragraph 36 of Lutz teaches "storing first data on the client in response to the received first request, said first data identifying the first service wherein the authentication of the user by the first service is optional" and "allowing the user to access the first service without authenticating" as recited in claim 1."

- The examiner respectfully disagrees with applicants logic and reasoning, the examiner points to paragraph: 0041, the examiner notes specifically that user send a request called "HTTP GET" to get access to management services (i.e. applicants second service), the user doesn't need to submit any authentication data for management resources, please see RFC 2616, now with this said, if the user wants access to more advanced personalized services (i.e. applicants first service), then the user can optionally provide authentication data to service provider.

Applicant states: "However, before the network management service selected by the user is executed, the user must enter "network **specific authentication information** which is required to

Art Unit: 2434

perform the network management service." (Page 4, [0043]; page 7, [0074]). Therefore, Lutz, alone or in combination with the other cited art, fails to teach or disclose "allowing the user to access the first service without authenticating" as recited in claim 1. "

- The examiner respectfully disagrees with applicants logic and reasoning, the examiner points to paragraph: 0041, the examiner notes specifically that user send a request called "HTTP GET" to get access to management services (i.e. applicants second service), the user doesn't need to submit any authentication data for management resources, please see RFC 2616, now with this said, if the user wants access to more advanced personalized services (i.e. applicants first service), then the user can optionally provide authentication data to service provider.

Applicant states: "In other words the client does not store information identifying the requested service, instead the client sends information identifying the requested service to the service provider."

- The examiner respectfully disagrees with applicants logic and reasoning, the examiner points to paragraph: 0041, the examiner notes that it is obvious that the service or applet (i.e. first data ) that the user requested is sent from the service provider to the user, i.e. for the user to interact with, (i.e. analyzer selection page), which is applicants "first data."

Applicant states: "For example, Lutz may disclose that a list of services is provided to the user, but Lutz fails to teach storing first data identifying the first requested service as recited in claim 22."

- The examiner respectfully disagrees with applicants logic and reasoning, the examiner points to paragraph: 0041, the examiner notes that it is obvious that the service or applet (i.e. first data ) that the user requested is sent from the service provider to the user, i.e. for the user to interact with, (i.e. analyzer selection page), which is applicants "first data."

Applicant states: "However, in this rejection, neither the element of receiving a second request from the second network server to provide the second service to the user

Art Unit: 2434

wherein authentication of the user by the second service is optional and wherein the user is not authenticated for the second service, nor the result of if the second service is not associated with the first policy group identified by the stored first data...allowing the unauthenticated user to access the second service during which the user continues to be unauthenticated for the second service is found in the combined art. ”

- The examiner respectfully disagrees with applicants logic and reasoning, the examiner points to paragraph: 0041, the examiner notes specifically that user send a request called “HTTP GET” to get access to management services (i.e. applicants second service), the user doesn’t need to submit any authentication data for management resources, please see RFC 2616, now with this said, if the user wants access to more advanced personalized services (i.e. applicants first service), then the user can optionally provide authentication data to service provider.

Applicant states: “However, in this rejection, neither the element of storing first data on the client in response to the received first request, said first data identifying the first service wherein authentication of the user by the first service is optional and wherein the user is not authenticated for the first service and not authenticated for the second service when the first data is stored nor the result of authenticating, in response to the authentication of the user for the second request, the user for the first service identified in the stored first data wherein, in response to the authentication of the user for the first service, the generated authentication ticket and profile information is communicated to the first service is found in the combined art. ”

- The examiner respectfully disagrees with applicants logic and reasoning, the examiner points to paragraph: 0041, the examiner notes specifically that user send a request called “HTTP GET” to get access to management services (i.e. applicants second service), the user doesn’t need to submit any authentication data for management resources, please see RFC 2616, now with this said, if the user wants access to more advanced personalized services (i.e. applicants first service), then the user can optionally provide authentication data to service provider.

Applicant states: “Applicants wish to expedite prosecution of this application. If the Examiner deems the application to not be in condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited and encouraged to telephone the undersigned to discuss making an Examiner's amendment to place the application in condition for allowance. ”

- *The examiner notes, the examiner points to applicants claims and applicants specification, the examiner notes to applicant that in the interests of moving prosecution forward in the application, and to overcome the examiners current prior art rejection, the examiner suggests the following be amended in the all independent claims, claim 20, also the language of paragraph: 0020, specifically dealing with central server, first policy group and second policy group, a database containing the first policy and second policy that is coupled to the central server, also paragraph: 0043, the 64 bit PUID that is encrypted, also in paragraph: 0073, after the user is authenticated by the central server, the user is only allowed to user the requested service for a predefined window of time. Applicant must also understand that any amendments to the claims will require further reconsideration and search at any future prosecution in the application.*

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103*

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said

Art Unit: 2434

subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claim(s) 1 – 10, 15, 19, 20, 22, 23, 30, 32 - 34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Venkataramappa (US 2003/0188193 A 1) in view of Zhang et al. (US 7036142 B1) further in view of Lutz (US Patent No. 2003/0204579 A1).

Both Venkataramappa and Zhang are references cited in the applicant's information Disclosure Statement.

Venkataramappa discloses a client that requests services from a first network server and a second network server and any subsequent network server in the network, Paragraph: 0054 & 0059 & 0060 & 0061. The client is authenticated by a first network server, the first network server sends a request to the KDC (i.e. central server) server, Paragraph: 0055. The KDC is made up of a Kerberos authentication server and a TGS (ticket granting service), Paragraph: 0053. The KDC allows the user or client to sign on only once, without having to sign on multiple times, the TGT and SSO token allows the second server or other servers to recognize which client or user has been authenticated before, Paragraph: 0057 & 0058 & 0059, and will not request that the user sign on again when requesting service or content from other or different servers on the network, Paragraphs: 0054 & 0067.

Venkataramappa does not appear to explicitly disclose first and second servers are in different domains or storing first data on the client in response to the received first request, said first data identifying the first service wherein the authentication of the user by the first service is optional, also Venkataramappa doesn't disclose allowing the user to access the first service without authenticating the user.

Art Unit: 2434

However, Zhang discloses single sign on users or subscribers to access both public and private domains (i.e. different domains and different domain content servers) when requesting content or service for the network server, Col 5, lines 30 - 51.

Further, However Lutz discloses, storing first data (i.e. the service providers HTTP response analyzer selection page) on the client in response to the received first request, said first data identifying the first service wherein the authentication of the user by the first service is optional (Paragraph: 0041); also Lutz, also discloses allowing the user to access the first service without authenticating the user(Paragraph: 0041), the examiner further notes that in paragraph: 0041, the examiner notes specifically that user sends a request called "HTTP GET" to get access to management services (i.e. applicants first service) which doesn't require an authentication ticket or user profile information, the user doesn't need to submit any authentication data for management resources, now with this said, if the user wants access to more advanced personalized services (i.e. applicants second service), then the user can optionally provide authentication data (i.e. applicants authentication ticket and profile information) to service provider .

Venkataramappa and Zhang and Lutz are analogous art because they are from the "same field of endeavor," allow a user to be authenticated and access multiple content servers.

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Venkataramappa and Zhang before him or her, to modify a client that requests



Art Unit: 2434

services from a first network server and a second network server and any subsequent network server in the network, Paragraph: 0054 & 0059 & 0060 & 0061. The client is authenticated by a first network server, the first network server sends a request to the KDC (i.e. central server) server, Paragraph: 0055. The KDC is made up of a authentication server and a TGS (ticket granting service), Paragraph: 0053. The KDC allows the user or client to sign on only once, without having to sign on multiple times, the TGT and SSO token allows the server or servers to recognize which client or user has been authenticated before, Paragraph: 0057 & 0058 & 0059 and will not request that the user sign on again, Paragraph 0054 & 0067 of Venkataramappa to include the authentication to access multiple domains, Col 5, lines 30 - 51 of Zhang, further to include the optional user authentication by the first server of Lutz, paragraph: 0041.

The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been to allow a user to sign on once and allowed access to multiple servers in multiple domains without having to re - authenticate again, Paragraph: 0074 of Lutz , please also see **KSR v. Teleflex**, 127 S.Ct. 1727, 1740, 82 USPQ2d 1385, 1396 (2007)) .

Therefore it would have been obvious to combine Venkataramappa with Zhang, further combine Lutz to obtain the invention as specified in the instant claim(s).

Claim(s) 35 - 38 are rejected under 35 USC 103 (a) as being obvious over Venkataramappa (US 2003/0188193 A 1) in view of Stanko (US PG PUB# 20050074126) further in view of Lutz (US Patent No. 2003/0204579 A1).

Art Unit: 2434

Both Venkataramappa and Stanko are references cited in the applicant's information Disclosure Statement.

Venkataramappa discloses a client that requests services from a first network server and a second network server and any subsequent network server in the network, Paragraph: 0054 & 0059 & 0060 & 0061. The client is authenticated by a first network server, the first network server sends a request to the KDC (i.e. central server) server, Paragraph: 0055. The KDC is made up of a Kerberos authentication server and a TGS (ticket granting service), Paragraph: 0053. The KDC allows the user or client to sign on only once, without having to sign on multiple times, the TGT and SSO token allows the second server or other servers to recognize which client or user has been authenticated before, Paragraph: 0057 & 0058 & 0059, and will not request that the user sign on again when requesting service or content from other or different servers on the network, Paragraphs: 0054 & 0067.

Venkataramappa does not appear to explicitly disclose a computer readable medium that executes a client that requests services from a first network server and a second network server and any subsequent network server in the network, the client is authenticated by a first network server, the first network server sends a request to the KDC (i.e. central server) server which is made up of a Kerberos authentication server and a TGS (ticket granting service), the KDC allows the user or client to sign on only once, without having to sign on multiple times, the TGT and SSO token allows the server or servers to recognize which client or user has been authenticated before, and will not request that the user sign on again, further Venkataramappa doesn't disclose a response component for storing first data on the client in response to the received first request, said first data identifying the first service wherein the authentication of the user by the first service is optional.

Art Unit: 2434

However, Stanko discloses a computer readable medium that allows a user through a client machine to be authenticated by an authentication server for access to a secure server that will provide content to the client or users request, Paragraph: 0042 & 0078. The user will only have to be authenticated once by the authentication server, to be allowed access to other secured servers on the network, Paragraph: 0050. This is possible by the fact that a authentication ticket is stored on both a the client and the authentication server to which other secured servers have access to on the network, Paragraph: 0048 & 0049 & 0050.

Further, However Lutz discloses, storing first data (i.e. the service providers HTTP response analyzer selection page) on the client in response to the received first request, said first data identifying the first service wherein the authentication of the user by the first service is optional (Paragraph: 0041); also Lutz, also discloses allowing the user to access the first service without authenticating the user (Paragraph: 0041).

Venkataramappa and Stanko and Lutz are analogous art because they are from the "same field of endeavor," which is the field of authenticating a user or client once, with a proof of the authentication stored on the client and the content server and the authentication authority, which will allow the user or client subsequent access to plurality of other content servers on the network without having to be re-authenticated again.

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Venkataramappa and Stanko before him or her, to modify a client that requests services from a first network server and a second network server

Art Unit: 2434

and any subsequent network server in the network, Paragraph: 0054 & 0059 & 0060 & 0061. The client is authenticated by a first network server, the first network server sends a request to the KDC (i.e. central server) server, Paragraph: 0055. The KDC is made up of a Kerberos authentication server and a TGS (ticket granting service), Paragraph: 0053. The KDC allows the user or client to sign on only once, without having to sign on multiple times, the TGT and SSO token allows the second server or other servers to recognize which client or user has been authenticated before, Paragraph: 0057 & 0058 & 0059, and will not request that the user sign on again when requesting service or content from other or different servers on the network, Paragraphs: 0054 & 0067 of Venkataramappa to include a computer readable medium that allows a user through a client machine to be authenticated by an authentication server for access to a secure server that will provide content to the client or user's request, Paragraph: 0042 & 0078. The user will only have to be authenticated once by the authentication server, to be allowed access to other secured servers on the network, Paragraph: 0050. This is possible by the fact that a authentication ticket is stored on both a the client and the authentication server, Paragraph: 0048 & 0049 & 0050 of Stanko, further to include the optional user authentication by the first server of Lutz, paragraph: 0041.

The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been allowing a user or client to access a vast array of information or content from a variety of sources in a network without having to authenticate numerous times when the user wants to request another service from a different content or service provider on the network, Paragraphs: 0074 of Lutz, also please see **KSR v. Teleflex**, 127 S.Ct. 1727, 1740, 82 USPQ2d 1385, 1396 (2007))

Art Unit: 2434

Therefore it would have been obvious to combine Stanko with Venkataramappa and further combined with Lutz to obtain the invention as specified in the instant claim(s).

### ***Conclusion***

**THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to DANT B. SHAFER HARRIMAN whose telephone number is (571)272-7910. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Thursday: 8:00am - 5:30pm Alt.Fridays off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kambiz Zand can be reached on (571) 272-3811. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2434

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

04/04/2009

/Dant B Shaifer - Harriman /  
Examiner, Art Unit 2434

/Kambiz Zand/  
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2434